



**Minutes of a meeting of Planning and Licensing Committee held on Wednesday, 10 April 2024**

**Councillors present:**

Ray Brassington – Chair  
Dilys Neill  
Michael Vann  
Mark Harris

Patrick Coleman – Vice Chair  
Gary Selwyn  
Julia Judd  
David Fowles

Daryl Corps

**Officers present:**

Ana Prelici, Democratic Services Officer  
Helen Blundell, Interim Head of Legal Services  
Adrian Harding, Interim Development  
Management Manager

Andrew Moody, Senior Planning Case Officer  
Martin Perks, Principal Planning Officer  
Kira Thompson, Election and Democratic  
Services Support Assistant

**Observers:**

Councillor David Cunningham and Lisa Spivey

**68 Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Andrew Maclean.

**69 Substitute Members**

There were no substitute members.

**70 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Dilys Neill stated for transparency that she knew the Parish Councillor on the first application, but had not discussed the item with them. This was not a pecuniary interest Councillor Neill had not pre-determined the application.

Councillor David Fowles stated that he potentially knew the owner of the cottages related to the second application, but that this was not pecuniary and he had not pre-determined the application.

**71 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting on 13 March 2024 were considered as part of the pack.

## Planning and Licensing Committee

10/April2024

The Interim Development Management Manager stated that on page 9, “in consultation with the Chair of The Planning and Licensing Committee” had been added to the minutes after publication.

The following amendments were addressed;

- Pg. 13 – “the Vice Chair took the Chair as the Chair was the Ward Member” (Chair to be added)
- Pg. 9 – “a member” should replace “members”
- Councillor Mark Harris stated that they wished to be referred to by his preferred pronouns “he”, instead of “they”. The Democratic Services Officer stated that the practice of utilising the generic “they” was outlined in the minute style guide, but that they could explore changing this practice.
- “ward ember” should read “ward member”

RESOLVED: That the Planning and Licensing Committee APPROVE minutes of the meeting held on 13 March 2024 subject to the amendments being made.

### Voting record

**8 For, 0 Against, 1 Abstention, 2 Absent/Did not vote**

For	Against	Abstain	Absent/Did not vote
Daryl Corps		Patrick Coleman	Andrew Maclean
David Fowles			Ian Watson
Dilys Neill			
Gary Selwyn			
Julia Judd			
Mark Harris			
Michael Vann			
Ray Brassington			

### **72** Chair's Announcements (if any)

There were no Chair Announcements.

### **73** Public questions

There were no public questions.

### **74** Member questions

The Interim Development Management Manager provided an update on the response to Councillor Dilys Neill’s question from the meeting of the Planning and Licensing Committee held on 13 December. The Interim Development Manager explained that delays had occurred due to the Forward Planning team’s focus on the Local Plan, but stated that a response would be provided to Councillor Neill within two weeks of the Committee.

**75 22/04163/FUL- The Feathered Nest Inn, Nether Westcote, Chipping Norton, Gloucestershire, OX7 6SD**

The Case Officer introduced the report. The application was for the erection of eight units of overnight accommodation and associated works at the Feathered Nest Inn, Nether Westcote, Chipping Norton, Gloucestershire, OX7 6S.

The public speakers were then invited to address the Committee.

Trevor Bigg, the Chair of Westcote Parish Meeting, addressed the Committee, raising objections to the application citing concerns over the location of the accommodation, stating that a closer proximity to the nearby building would have been preferable to prevent increased light pollution and visibility from the village.

Victoria Taylor, an Objector addressed the Committee, raising objections over road traffic, and the Conservation Area and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Neil Warner from JPPC, the agent for the application, addressed the application. They stated that the overarching purpose of the application was to ensure the financial sustainability of the pub business.

Councillor David Cunningham addressed the committee as the Ward Member and raised concerns on the lack of public benefit to the application, and the impact on the AONB and Conservation Area.

Members who had attended the Site Inspection Briefing commented on the application;

- There were strong examples of local vernacular in the nearby architecture but the impact of the application did not seem to be as impactful as initially expected.
- The new buildings would be partially screened by nearby vegetation.
- It was useful to see and hear residents' concerns.

### Member Questions

There were various questions from Members, which the Case Officer and the Interim Development Management Manager responded to;

- The conditions aimed to regiment parking spaces, but the management of these was down to the applicant to execute. The Case Officer added that the level of traffic was not expected to substantially increase from current levels.
- The planning history of the site involved multiple past permissions, some of which included use by caravans. The Case Officer stated that each application should be considered on its own merits, and these would have been acceptable at the time.
- Members asked if the new buildings were very far away from the principal pub building in order to make it easier to convert them into dwellings in the future. The Case Officer stated that they didn't believe this to be the case as the accommodation units were intended to be serviced units and ancillary to the pub, but that the applicant could bring such a future application forward. If a future application was brought forward, it would need to be judged on its own merits.
- The Case Officer stated that the application's impact on the setting of the conservation area should be taken into consideration, but that the proposed was considered not to harm the heritage asset.
- The Case Officer did not consider that there was any harm to dark skies.

- The public benefit was discussed as per the Ward Member's comments. The Case Officer stated that this would be a material planning consideration in the case of impact on a heritage asset, when harm was identified.

### Member Comments

Members discussed the application, stating the following points;

- The Case Officer had negotiated with the applicant to improve the proposal comparative to what had initially been applied for, with particular note to the reduced footprint of the application.
- It was felt by some that the units would not be visible from the public right of way.
- Businesses needed to be supported in being economically viable, but this needed to be balanced with the needs of the community, with some stating that the village would be harmed by the proposal.

Councillor Patrick Coleman proposed permitting the application, agreeing with the Officer's recommendation. Councillor Coleman stated that no statutory consultees had objected and that he could not see a reason to refuse.

Councillor Julia Judd seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED: To PERMIT the application.

### **Voting Record**

**7 For, 2 Against, 0 Abstentions, 2 Absent/Did not vote**

For	Against	Abstain	Absent/Did not vote
Ray Brassington	Daryl Corps		Andrew Maclean
Patrick Coleman	David Fowles		Ian Watson
Dilys Neill			
Gary Selwyn			
Julia Judd			
Mark Harris			
Michael Vann			

After voting on the item, the Committee adjourned at 15.24, returning at 15.30.

### **76 24/00055/PLP- Land South Of 1 - 3 Corner Houses, Driffield, Gloucestershire, GL7 5QA**

The Case Officer introduced the item. The application was for the permission in principle for the construction of two dwellings at Land South of 1 – 3 Corner Houses Driffield Gloucestershire GL7 5QA.

Councillor David Fowles stated that he knew the owners of the land but that it did not constitute a pecuniary interest on his part and he had not pre-determined the application.

Joe Seymour from McLoughlin Planning Ltd, the agent on the application addressed the Committee. He stated that the applicant was a small scale house builder and that the application was for two new houses.

Councillor Lisa Spivey addressed the Committee as the Ward Member. Councillor Spivey explained that she had referred the application to the Committee due to a potential conflict between Local Plan Policies DS3 (Small-Scale Residential Development In Non-Principal Settlements) and DS4 (Open Market Housing Outside Principal And Non-Principal Settlements).

### Member Questions

Members asked questions, to which the Case Officer provided answers;

- On the point of what a permission in principle application constituted, the Case Officer referred to paragraph 10.4 of their report, which stated; “With regard to the decision making process, the PPG (Planning Practice Guidance) states: ‘How must a decision on whether to grant permission in principle to a site be made? A decision on whether to grant permission in principle to a site following a valid application or by entering it on Part 2 of a brownfield land register must be made in accordance with relevant policies in the development plan unless there are material considerations, such as those in the National Planning Policy Framework and national guidance, which indicate otherwise.’” The Committee would therefore need to make its decision on the sustainability of development in this location.
- There were no details for the garden’s ownership, as that information was not required for a permission in principle application.
- The Local Plan review that was underway included review of policy DS3 but that this was not material to the application.
- It was confirmed that the appeal process was the same as for any other application.
- The Highways Authority recommended refusal, but this was due to a blanket approach to all development in non-principal boundaries which did not take into consideration the existence of DS3 which was conflicting.

### Member Comments

Members commented on the application, stating that Ampney Crucis was closely related to the village of Driffield, and served it in terms of amenities. This was considered a good opportunity to support the village’s growth in a way that was proportionate in scale.

Councillor Julia Judd proposed permitting the application, agreeing with the recommendations in the report, and adding that the applicant had built sympathetically designed homes at a small scale across the district.

Councillor Dilys Neill seconded the proposal.

RESOLVED: To PERMIT the application

### **Voting record**

**9 For, 0 Against, 0 Abstentions, 2 Absent/Did not vote**

For	Against	Abstentions	Absent/Did not vote
Ray Brassington			Ian Watson
Patrick Coleman			Andrew Maclean
Daryl Corps			
David Fowles			
Dilys Neill			
Gary Selwyn			
Julia Judd			
Mark Harris			
Michael Vann			

### **77 Sites Inspection Briefing (SIB)**

The Interim Development Management Manager stated that they would be in touch if this was required. Members asked whether the Environment Agency could attend Future Briefings. The Interim Development Management Manager stated that the Environment Agency could be invited but that the Council had no legal powers in compelling them to attend.

### **78 Licensing Sub-Committee**

The Democratic Services Officer stated that a Licensing Sub-Committee was not required at present.

The Meeting commenced at 2.00 pm and closed at 4.01 pm

Chair

(END)